

SECTION 5

Coordination

Since the initiation of the study in spring 1998, the LCTIP has met with representatives from federal and state resource agencies, county and local officials, transportation service agencies, business and civic groups, and local residents. Through a structured coordination and communication program designed to encourage maximum input, everyone with an interest in transportation has gathered information and offered input to the study. The LCTIP's program has been tailored to three primary audiences: agency and elected officials, interested groups, and the public.

This study has been designed to encourage maximum input from government, transportation, and planning organizations, as well as the public. This section provides a summary of the agency coordination and public involvement that has occurred during the preparation of the DEIS.

5.1 Federal, State, and Local Agency Coordination

5.1.1 Introduction

At the beginning of the study, groups were established with various agencies and elected officials to inform them of study activities, encourage meaningful dialog, and receive feedback on major study issues. Established groups include the Resource Agency Group (RAG), Municipal Groups (MGs), Technical Advisory Group (TAG), and the Lake County

Board Joint Committee. These groups have provided input to the process, including perceptions on transportation needs/issues, assistance with obtaining data, study approach, and study output review. Following is an overview of the four groups and their role in the study.

5.1.2 Resource Agency Group

The RAG, comprised of state and federal resource and regulatory agencies involved in the NEPA process, included representatives from the agencies listed in Table 5-1.

The role of the RAG was to:

- Communicate issues, concerns, and regulatory requirements associated with resources in the study area
- Review technical aspects of the study
- Review and provide input in developing evaluation factors, criteria, and other performance measures to be used in alternative development and screening
- Serve as a communication link to and from the representative agencies and the group
- Attend meetings regularly and share agency information

It was recognized from an environmental perspective that this study would require a different approach for identifying, measuring, and analyzing impacts. The RAG has been instrumental in assisting the study team in

TABLE 5-1
Resource Agency Group Membership

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)*• US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)• US Army Corp of Engineers (USACOE)• USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)• Illinois Nature Preserves Commission (INPC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Illinois Department of Agriculture (IDOA)• Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR)*• Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA)• US Department of Housing and Urban Development (USHUD)
--	--

* Two agencies that serve on this group, USEPA and IDNR, also served on the TAG.

developing a reasonable approach for considering environmental concerns over the large study area (which is in excess of 1,295 km², or 500 mi²). The recommended approach involved developing an environmental database, compiled as a GIS database. Through group exercises, members reviewed environmental data, provided input, and agreed that the use and accuracy of available data is acceptable for this study. The RAG, through group exercises, also participated in refining the objectives developed by the TAG by examining how the objectives relate to the Purpose and Need.

The RAG contributed to the alternatives development process and agreed that the initial sets of roadway and transit improvements represented a reasonable range of alternatives for consideration.

The group met nine times in a group forum to discuss analysis methodology, resource issues, and regulatory issues (see Table 5-2, on the following page). Minutes from these meetings are included in the study record, and included in the *Public Involvement and Coordination Summary Report*.

Correspondence with resource agencies is included in Appendix G. Correspondence early in the study process involved data sharing from existing agency databases and identification of resource issues to be addressed in the environmental documentation. Correspondence later in the study process included input from the USFWS addressing the presence of federally threatened and endangered species in the vicinity of the finalist alternatives.

The purpose of the individual meetings with IDNR, IDOA, USEPA, USACOE, USFWS, and USHUD prior to release of the DEIS was to discuss the approaches and revisions to some of the study methodologies based on their area of expertise and interest. Overall the resource agencies were satisfied with the overall process and the level of detail used in the analysis. The IDNR agreed with the study approach and more specifically agreed with the functional wetland assessment methodology applied to the impacted wetlands in the study area.

The USEPA was supportive of the LCTIP's planning process, and suggested that it be used on other projects. Regarding the Finalist Alternatives, the USEPA noted their agency's emphasis on wetland impacts, while also acknowledging the trade-offs associated with impacts to other resources. The USEPA also concurred with the LCTIP's wetland assessment methodology.

The IDOA requested that additional information be included in the agricultural analysis, including: (1) a more definitive assessment of prime and important farmland impacts for the build alternatives; (2) the use of the most recent satellite imagery; (3) an assessment of the number of farm operation impacts, and (4) an assessment of the number of uneconomic farm remnants created by the alternatives. Based on the suitability of the analysis for this type of study, the analyses identified in points 1 and 2 were incorporated into the study and the results are reflected in this DEIS. Points 3 and 4 would be addressed as part of future analyses for the preferred alternative.

The USACOE agreed with the overall process and agreed in concept with the wetland assessment methodology. Based on meeting dialog the USACOE suggested that a field review with USACOE and LCTIP staff be conducted to verify the methodology and scoring system applied in the assessment. Following the field review the USACOE suggested two refinements to the assessment: eliminate Class IV wetlands, and modify the scoring system to acknowledge the value of smaller wetland sites. Both of these suggestions were implemented and the results of the revised assessment methodology are included in this DEIS.

The USFWS indicated agreement with the wetland methodology however, expressed some concern for the flood attenuation scores. Further discussion of this issue led to concurrence with the process by USFWS for a macro level analysis.

The USHUD stated that their primary issue is growth patterns in the region. Specifically they will be examining the growth impacts associated with each alternative. Overall they have

indicated agreement with the level of effort that has been expended in this study.

5.1.3 Municipal Groups

There are 73 municipalities in the study area. Given the large number of jurisdictions involved, each municipality was assigned to one of six groups, based on geography, to allow for small group interaction with the

study team. The objective of meeting with municipalities was to gather local perspectives and input, as well as provide information to the municipalities. Specific roles and responsibilities include:

- Review study progress
- Provide input on general study direction
- Understand the process

TABLE 5-2
Resource Agency Group Meetings

	Meeting Date	Topic
Meeting 1	April 1998	Introduction to study, role of the RAG, GIS application overview, and pilot demonstration.
Meeting 2	June 1998	IDOT's and ISTHA's expectations for working with the RAG. The resource and regulatory agencies' expectations for a successful process. Review of the basic elements of the GIS database for this study. Review of the appropriate level of detail desired for information in the GIS database.
Combined Meeting *	August 1998	Transportation Workshop and Fair: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Series of presentations providing an overview of the modes that may be applicable to the LCTIP, including arterial, highway, rail, bus, and transportation management strategies. Representatives from regional planning agencies and interest groups were available at presentation booths to discuss specific initiatives and programs. • Group exercises following the formal presentations to discuss the applicability of these strategies to the study area.
Meeting 3	August 1998	Purpose and Need for the project, results of the individual agency meetings, and GIS analysis methods.
Meeting 4	October 1998	Transportation system performance analysis, review Purpose and Need, environmental evaluation factors, review project schedule
Meeting 5	December 1998	Transportation System Performance Report preview, alternatives development, evaluation methodology
Meeting 6	June 1999	Alternatives development, environmental considerations
Meeting 7	May 2000	Summary of comments from PIM #1 and PIM #2 and overview of materials presented at the meetings, review of the finalist two alternatives, environmental resource measures, and proposed refinements/ enhancements to environmental database for next steps of the process.
Meeting 8	October 2000	PIM #2 summary; overview of TAG Meeting #6 and MG Meeting #5; presentation and discussion of the finalist alternatives as it relates to refinements, alternative specific population and employment forecasts, environmental impacts, and travel performance; and presentation and discussion of impact assessment methods wetlands, biological, water resources, noise, air quality, cultural resources, and secondary and cumulative impacts.
Individual Meetings	May 2001	Individual meetings with IDNR, IDOA, USEPA, USFWS and USHUD to discuss the approaches and resource assessment methodology prior to release of the DEIS

* Joint Transportation Workshop and Fair with representatives from the TAG, the MGs, Lake County Board, and area legislators

- Participate at public events
- Identify need for local or community meetings

The MGs contributed to the study team's understanding of local transportation issues, increasing the sensitivity to local issues that can be addressed as part of a larger study. The technical analyses completed by the study team, such as the *Transportation System Performance Report*, were supported by the perceptions and insights shared by local officials at these meetings. The group helped the study establish a broad base at the local level. As the group members communicated study findings and issues to their constituents, they often identified opportunities for further LCTIP interaction via the speakers' bureau events.

The group convened six times to discuss the transportation issues facing the study area, the results of technical analyses, and alternative concepts (see Table 5-3). Minutes from each meeting are included in the study record, and included in the *Public Involvement and*

Coordination Summary Report. All meetings were open to the public and public input and comments were solicited at the end of each meeting.

5.1.4 Technical Advisory Group

The TAG consists of representatives from transportation service providers, resource agencies, local government, and regional planning agencies. These representatives are listed in Table 5-4 (on the following page).

The TAG provided input on technical issues relating to transportation needs and alternatives development and evaluation. Specific roles and responsibilities included:

- Review the progress of the study and provide input to the study team on technical approaches, technical input, and output from the study
- Serve as a communication link to and from the representative communities and agencies
- Serve as a visible part of the study by attending study events (such as public

TABLE 5-3
Municipal Groups Meetings

	Meeting Date	Topic
Meeting 1	May/June 1998	Introduction to study and role of the MG. Group exercise to identify transportation issues facing the study area.
Combined Meeting*	August 1998	Transportation Workshop and Fair: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Series of presentations providing an overview of the modes that may be applicable the LCTIP, including arterial, highway, rail, bus, and transportation management strategies. Representatives from regional planning agencies and interest groups were available at presentation booths to discuss specific initiatives and programs. • Group exercise following the formal presentations to discuss the applicability of these strategies to the study area.
Meeting 2	January 1999	Findings of the <i>Transportation System Performance Report</i> .
Meeting 3	July 1999	Presentation of the initial roadway and transit improvements, including transportation performance and potential impact data. (Meeting prior to PIM #1)
Meeting 4	May 2000	Presentation of the roadway refinement process, transportation performance measures, and recommended finalist improvements. (Meeting prior to PIM #2)
Meeting 5	October 2000	Refinements to finalist transit enhancements and roadway alternatives including a discussion of the refinement process, transportation performance data, and potential impacts.

* Joint Transportation Workshop and Fair with representatives from the TAG, the RAG, Lake County Board, and area legislators

meetings) and identifying local meeting needs

This group provided a forum for the study team to present and discuss technical processes. For example, early in the study, the TAG assisted the study team in establishing a number of study objectives from transportation issues identified at other public and group meetings. Working through a group workshop, the representatives identified the following objectives:

- Road Network
 - Attract travel to the appropriate functional facilities
 - Provide sufficient capacity on major corridors
 - Reduce network congestion
- Public Transportation
 - Determine appropriate level of transit that can be achieved
 - Improve transit connections to final destinations
- Environmental
 - Protect and preserve important environmental and societal resources
- Other
 - Focus improvements to support local economic development objectives and land use preferences

- Consider regional travel needs

The TAG representatives from the various transportation service providers were also instrumental in working with the LCTIP to identify projects that would be built regardless of the recommendations made by the LCTIP (creating the No-Action Alternative [Baseline]). The group was supportive of an open examination of alternatives, regardless of jurisdiction. This led to a wide examination of alternatives in terms of both geography and mode (i.e., road, rail, and bus).

The group met seven times during the study. Table 5-5 (on the following page) summarizes the topics discussed at these meetings. Minutes from each of these meetings are included in the study record, and included in the *Public Involvement and Coordination Summary Report*. All meetings were open to the public and public input and comments were solicited at the end of each meeting.

5.1.5 Lake County Board Joint Committees

The LCTIP met with the Lake County Board Joint Committees (Planning, Building & Zoning and Public Works & Transportation) seven times during the study. The Lake County Board Joint Committees identified improving transportation as one of their top priorities. They adopted a resolution in support of this process and provided a forum for the LCTIP and other interested groups to discuss transportation issues and study findings. At the

TABLE 5-4
Technical Advisory Group Membership

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illinois Department of Transportation • Illinois State Toll Highway Authority • Chicago Area Transportation Study • Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission • Regional Transportation Authority • Metra • Pace • Illinois DNR (ex-officio member)* • USEPA (ex-officio member)* • FHWA (ex-officio member) • Lake County Division of Transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lake County Department of Planning and Development • Cook County Highway Department • McHenry County Highway Department • Kenosha County Division of Highways • Federal Transit Administration • Municipal Group #1 Representatives (2) • Municipal Group #2 Representative • Municipal Group #3 Representative • Municipal Group #4 Representative • Municipal Group #5 Representative • Municipal Group #6 Representative
---	---

*The USEPA represents the federal resource agencies and the IDNR represents state resource agencies.

beginning of the study, this group helped the LCTIP define the transportation issues facing the county. As the study progressed the LCTIP met with elected officials to share information at key study milestones and to solicit input. The Lake County Board Joint Committees supported the study process and suggested analyses for further examination. For example, one examination included how the transportation proposals would influence the county road system. In response, the LCTIP did an extensive analysis of the changes to the county route system.

The *Transportation System Performance Report*, *Alternatives Development and Evaluation Report*, and this DEIS will serve as a foundation for future transportation planning in the county. Table 5-6 (on the following page) provides an overview of the specific

topics discussed at each meeting. Meeting minutes are included in the study record, and included in the *Public Involvement and Coordination Summary Report*.

5.2 The Public and Interested Groups

Opportunities for public involvement included a community-based working office in Mundelein, an interactive web site, and a wide variety of forums for public comment, including focus groups, PIMs, speakers' bureaus, and agency and elected official meetings. Up-to-date study information was provided in regular newsletters and on the study web site. The study team employed a broad range of activities to maximize the

TABLE 5-5
Technical Advisory Group Meetings

	Meeting Date	Topic
Meeting 1	June 1998	Introduction to study and role of the TAG. Group exercise to identify transportation issues facing the study area.
Combined Meeting *	August 1998	Transportation Workshop and Fair: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Series of presentations providing an overview of the modes that may be applicable to the LCTIP, including arterial, highway, rail, bus, and transportation management strategies. Representatives from regional planning agencies and interest groups were available at display booths to discuss specific initiatives and programs. Group exercise following the formal presentations to discuss the applicability of these strategies to the study area.
Meeting 2	October 1998	Overview of the "Technical Tools" that will be employed on this study including: GIS, travel demand forecasting, and regional growth scenarios. Presentation included an overview of the perceived transportation issues in the study area as well as a workshop to assist in the development of project objectives.
Meeting 3	January 1999	<i>Transportation System Performance Report</i> findings; project No-Action (or Baseline) Improvements; overview of the alternatives development & alternatives evaluation process
Meeting 4	June 1999	Purpose and Need for the study; alternatives development process; Preliminary roadway and transit improvements
Meeting 5	May 2000	Roadway refinement process; performance measures; finalist roadway & transit improvements
Meeting 6	October 2000	Finalist transit enhancements; finalist roadway alternatives including discussion of refinements, impacts, and performance

* Joint Transportation Workshop and Fair with representatives from the RAG, the MGs, Lake County Board, and area legislators.

participation of groups and individuals in the planning process.

5.2.1 Poll and Focus Groups

During the early months of this study, surveys were conducted by the study team to gauge the perception of the transportation system user in the study area and to acquire input on the transportation issues of the study area. Public input was first gained through a series of four focus groups conducted in March 1998. The primary objective of this exercise was to identify perceived problems and potential solutions regarding transportation in the study area. The results were used to identify the issues of importance from the participants' perspective that could be further explored. The focus groups were comprised of people who commuted by automobile or public transportation, those who commuted short as well as long distances to work, and those who did not commute to work. The participants reflected a variety of commuting patterns and opinions.

The overall perception of the participants was that the transportation problems of Lake County were rapidly worsening. Participants felt that improving the transportation system should be a top priority for the county. The most frequently cited issue was road improvement, followed by train and bus system improvements. See the *Transportation System Performance Report, Appendix A*.

The focus group exercise was followed by an extensive countywide survey. Between April and May 1998, 500 random telephone interviews were conducted with licensed drivers in Lake County. The survey respondents were comprised of automobile and transit commuters, as well as people who walked or car/van pooled.¹

The phone survey results are included in the *Transportation System Performance Report, Appendix B*. The majority of respondents identified congestion on main roads, at intersections, and in residential areas as the most important transportation issue in Lake

TABLE 5-6
Lake County Board Joint Committee Meetings

	Meeting Date	Topic
Meeting 1	May 1998	Introduction to study and process, define transportation issues.
Combined Meeting *	August 1998	Transportation Workshop and Fair: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Series of presentations providing an overview of the modes that may be applicable the LCTIP, including arterial, highway, rail, bus, and transportation management strategies. Representatives from regional planning agencies and interest groups were available at presentation booths to discuss specific initiatives and programs. • Group exercise following the formal presentations to discuss the applicability of these strategies to the study area.
Meeting 2	January 1999	Findings from the <i>Transportation System Performance Report</i> .
Meeting 3	May 1999	Population and employment forecasts, alternatives development and evaluation process; <i>Crossroads</i> review.
Meeting 4	August 1999	Initial component improvements for roadway, transit, and traffic management (Prior PIM #1).
Meeting 5	May 2000	Refinements and evaluation to finalists.
Meeting 6	November 2000	Refinements to finalist alternatives. Response to the county's request for data on the effect the LCTIP alternatives would have on county roads and growth distribution.

* Joint Transportation Workshop and Fair with representatives from the TAG, the RAG, the MGs, and area legislators

County. The need for improvements to major north-south and east-west routes was a common response. Public transportation registered less concern by the public.

When asked to rate possible transportation solutions, 75 percent of respondents indicated that road improvements should be planned in advance of development. Additionally, respondents indicated a strong interest in solutions that would improve the road network, including intersection improvements, road widening, new highways, and traffic signal coordination. The poll and focus group information, coupled with input from the agency and elected officials and technical analyses, provided the basis for developing alternative solutions.

5.2.2 Public Informational Meetings

Two rounds of public meetings were held during the study process. For each round, meetings were held in multiple locations throughout the study area for the convenience of participants. The meetings were announced through study newsletters, advertisements in local newspapers, news releases, and invitation letters to interested individuals/groups on the study mailing list.

The public meetings were conducted in an open-house format, with personnel from the LCTIP, their consultants, IDOT, ISTHA, PACE, Metra, RTA, and CATS present to answer questions and receive comments about the study. A Public Hearing will be held after release of this DEIS for public review and comment. The hearing will also be held in different locations in the study area, and conducted in an open-house format.

5.2.2.1 Public Informational Meeting #1

In August 1999, the LCTIP presented the initial roadway, rail, and bus improvements. More than 800 people attended the events to review the proposed improvements, ask questions, and provide input. In addition to the strong turnout at the meetings, nearly 600 written and oral comments were received.

The overwhelming majority of participants agreed that major transportation improvements are needed in one form or another. Following is a summary of the major recurring comments and questions.

- A majority of commenters supported major transportation improvements; by a margin of 2:1, commenters supported the IL 53 set of improvements
- Commenters expressed a high degree of frustration with existing traffic congestion and a desire for road improvements to be built as soon as possible
- Many were concerned with the failure of road improvements to keep pace with development
- Many believed growth would happen regardless of road improvements
- Some wanted to know if more can be gotten from the existing transportation system (e.g., traffic signal coordination, road underpass/overpass at railroad crossings, and additional turning lanes at intersections)
- Others wanted to know if IL 53 would cause development and growth
- Some supported improving existing roads and seeing what happens
- Some were interested in providing improvements for alternative types of transportation (transit, bicycles, and pedestrians)
- Some asked if the quality of environmental resources is being considered when assessing impacts

Newsletter No. 3 (Fall 1999), located in Appendix H, provides a summary of staff responses to these comments and questions. A full summary of the meeting is available in the project file, including responses to individual comments received at the meeting.

5.2.2.2 Public Informational Meeting #2

The second round of public meetings was held in May 2000. Nearly 4,000 comments were

received at the meetings, which underscores the strong support that has evolved for this planning process. Following is a summary of the comments gathered at the event.

- The majority of comments centered on the IL 53 set of improvements; by a margin of 4:1, people expressed their support for the extension of IL 53
- Some wanted to know what is being done to improve existing roads
- Some asked if the finalist alternatives would cause more growth
- Some asked if improving existing roads would have fewer impacts

Newsletter No. 4 (Summer 2000), located in Appendix I, provides a summary of staff responses to these comments and questions. A full summary of the meeting is available in the project file, including responses to individual comments received at the meeting.

5.2.3 Project Videos

Three videos were developed during the study. The first video was an introductory video describing the project. The second and third videos were prepared for the first and second public meetings. These videos provided an overview of the progress and accomplishments of the project to date, as well as introduced the materials presented at the meetings. A copy of each video was distributed to all elected officials in the study area, and was included in the project record. The videos were also shown on local cable television in several communities.

5.2.4 Speakers' Bureau

A speakers' bureau was established as a forum to speak with interested groups and the media about the study. The speakers' bureau included:

- A presentation (slide show) that was updated throughout the study
- Study-related materials for distribution
- Study team staff to respond to questions

This type of venue served multiple purposes, including elevating the awareness of this study and its progress, ability to meet with organizations on short notice, and demonstrating the LCTIP's interest in receiving input.

Through this forum, the study team participated in approximately 60 meetings. Table 5-7 (on the following page) summarizes the groups that were involved in these events. Summaries of each meeting are included in the study record, and included in the *Public Involvement and Coordination Summary Report*.

5.2.5 Project Office

A project office established in Lake County in Mundelein is staffed by a management team consisting of the project managers and an administrative assistant. The office serves as a central location for public outreach, including phone inquiries, small group meetings, and press conferences, and as a drop-in center for interested individuals to visit and discuss the study or review specific materials. The office received over 1,000 visitors/phone inquiries during the study.

5.2.6 Newsletters

Five study newsletters were distributed throughout the development of the DEIS. The newsletters describe important study information and provide opportunities for public input. For example, the first two study newsletters that were distributed included postage paid comment forms. The newsletters were distributed by mail and posted to the study web site. Table 5-8 (on page 5-11) provides an overview of each newsletter.

In addition to the newsletters, two study brochures were developed and distributed. The first brochure provided an introduction and overview of the study and planning process. The second brochure provided a detailed description of the alternatives development and evaluation process. The first brochure was distributed at early group meetings and the Transportation Workshop and Fair. The second brochure was posted to the study web

site, mailed to group members and elected officials, and available as a handout at the PIMs.

5.2.7 Web Site

A study web site, <http://www.lakecountytip.com>, was established as another means of disseminating information about the study. The site, updated regularly, was promoted via study newsletters and other means. Initially, the site contained general study information, including an introduction to

the study, study organization, and schedule. It also contained a form-based inquiry/feedback page. As the study progressed, the following information was posted on the site:

- Study group meeting summaries
- PIM summaries
- Newsletters
- Frequently asked questions and answers
- Study findings and reports, including:
 - Transportation System Performance Report

TABLE 5-7
Group Meeting List

American Society of Civil Engineers	Lake Cook TMA	Lincolnshire Rotary
Antioch Lions Club	Lake County and DuPage County Chapter of APWA	Lindenhurst Village Board
Antioch Rotary	Lake County Chamber of Commerce	Long Grove Rotary
Barrington Area Council of Governments	Lake County Farm Bureau	McHenry EDC
Barrington Lions Club	Lake County Municipal League	Mundelein High School
Buffalo Grove Chamber of Commerce	Lake County Partners	Mundelein, Vernon Hills, Libertyville Kiwanis
Citizens to Protect Quality of Life Through Better Transportation	Lake Forest City Council	Mundelein Village Board
Deerfield, Bannockburn, Riverwoods Chamber of Commerce	Lake Forest Hospital	Northern IL Business PAC
Deerfield Senior's Men Club	Lake Forest, Lake Bluff Kiwanis Club	Northwest Municipal Conference
Grayslake AARP	Lake Forest, Lake Bluff Lions Club	Power Breakfast
Grayslake Chamber of Commerce	Lake Zurich Rotary	Rotary of Mundelein, Vernon Hills
Grayslake Chapter of American Business Women's Association	Lake Zurich Revitalization Project	Stevenson High School
Greater Lincolnshire Chamber of Commerce	Lake Zurich Village Board	Transportation forum sponsored by the League of Women Voters
Gurnee Breakfast Exchange	Libertyville Junior Women's Club	Vernon Hills, Grayslake, Gurnee, and Kildeer Village Boards
Highland Park Good Morning Rotary	Libertyville Kiwanis Club	Wauconda Rotary
Highland Park Kiwanis Club	Libertyville, Mundelein, Vernon Hills Chamber of Commerce	Waukegan Rotary
Highland Park Lions Club	Libertyville Noon Rotary	Zion Benton Kiwanis Club
Kiwanis Club of Gurnee	Libertyville Sunrise Rotary	Zion Chamber of Commerce Zion Exchange Club

- Initial, refined, and finalist alternatives
- Transit improvements
- Alternatives Development and Evaluation Report
- Draft Environmental Impact Statement
- Links to other web sites:
 - IDOT, <http://www.dot.state.il.us>
 - ISTHA, <http://www.illinoistollway.com>

The study web site was accessed by nearly 5,000 users, and approximately 300 comments were received by the form-based inquiry/feedback page.

5.2.8 Mailing List

A mailing list of over 3,500 names was maintained and updated regularly throughout the course of the study. The list included interested individuals, representatives of interest groups, state, county, and local elected officials, and appropriate agency personnel. The mailing list was used to generate labels for newsletter mailings and letters for more specific mailings, such as meeting invitations.

5.3 The Effect of Coordination Activities

Providing information and receiving feedback has been a foundation element of the study process. Through a structured program that has provided numerous opportunities for input, the LCTIP has been able to obtain the broadest participation at all levels: the public, interested groups, agencies, and elected officials.

Using a multitude of communication tools, the public has had numerous avenues to get involved. With nearly 100 meetings—including interested groups, two major public meetings, a transportation fair, numerous TAG and MG meetings, newsletters, web site, and media—the people in Lake County have had a chance to hear and be heard. Through an unprecedented outreach program, the LCTIP has gained a thorough understanding of the transportation issues facing Lake County and area residents have also become better educated about transportation. Residents cite congestion as their primary quality of life issue, and place an emphasis on improving the roadway system, followed by transit. People recognize that the rapid rise in population has contributed greatly to the transportation crisis Lake County faces. Continued growth in the county will only worsen the transportation problems facing the county if no major improvements are implemented.

TABLE 5-8
Newsletter Overview

Newsletter No.	When Distributed	Topics
1	Fall 1998	Introduction to study Public involvement avenues Transportation issues
2	Spring 1999	Transportation system performance findings No-Action (Baseline) network & forecasts Alternative development and evaluation process
3	Fall 1999 – Following PIM # 1	Presentation of initial alternatives and impacts Crossroads review Public comments/responses
4	Summer 2000 – Following PIM # 2	Finalist roadway and transit improvements Public comments/responses
5	Summer 2001	DEIS release, key findings, Public Hearing invitation

The LCTIP is a collective planning effort that has garnered widespread support, bringing together transportation service providers, communities, and elected officials. The study has embraced a process that allowed for the investigation of a broad analysis of alternative solutions, including the ideas of others. Based on input received, the LCTIP considered an east-west improvement scenario, which focused on improving east-west arterials (see Section 3, *Alternatives*). The LCTIP considered alternative solutions put forth by interest groups (Section 3, *Crossroads Plan*) and perceptions that smaller scale projects, such as adding turning lanes at intersections, synchronizing traffic signals, etc., could meet Lake County's transportation needs. In addition, the LCTIP analyzed the effects of the finalists on the roadways maintained by the county.

Early perceptions that new highways would cause massive growth were another important consideration of the LCTIP. Through a rigorous analysis using methodologies endorsed by NIPC, the LCTIP was able to isolate the growth impacts of the project No-Action (Baseline), transit, and finalist roadway alternatives. It was clear from the analysis that the impact of transportation on growth in Lake County is minimal. The analysis reinforced the realization that factors other than transportation are driving Lake County's rapid growth and that transportation improvements are needed to keep the county out of gridlock.

The thousands of comments received during this study have emphasized a frustration with growing congestion and the need for major improvements. The LCTIP has focused the transportation discussion on the major problems and potential solutions. The central premise has been to provide ample opportunities for every person that has an interest in transportation to voice their opinions so that the best decision can be made.

The public involvement process that helped determine the need, the objectives, and the alternatives is a measurable success. Support for major improvements, in particular the IL 53 extension, has been clearly expressed by Lake County residents, business groups, communities, and elected officials. Thousands of individuals and numerous communities, business groups, and elected officials have expressed their support, citing its superior transportation benefits, cost effectiveness, minimal impact to existing homes and businesses, and/or minimal disruption during construction as compared to other alternatives. Table 5-9 summarizes the comments that were received at various public forums during the study.

TABLE 5-9
Summary of Comments Regarding the IL 53 Set of Improvements

Forum	Support	Oppose
1999 Public Informational Meeting*	56%	33%
2000 Public Informational Meeting*	79%	19%
Communities (number)	20	2
Organizations (number)	18	7

* Total percent for the 1999 and 2000 Public Informational Meetings do not add to 100 percent. The remainder is associated with other alternatives presented.

Source: LCTIP